Disciplinary Panel Hearing

Case of:

RICS v Mr Imran Ali [6962684]

Tuesday 1 July to Wednesday 2 July 2025

Remotely by Microsoft Teams

Panel

Ms Jane Bishop (Lay Chairman)

Mr Paul Curtis (Lay Member)

Ms Jennifer Hobart MRICS (Surveyor Member)

Legal Adviser

Mr Alastair McFarlane

RICS Presenting Officer

Mr Christopher Geering

Member

Mr Imran Ali (did not attend and was not represented)

Hearing Officer

Mr Adeel Qureshi

1. RICS was represented by Mr Geering. Mr Ali did not attend and was not represented. The Panel had before it two bundle of papers, numbered pages 1 – 370 and 1-182, a correspondence bundle numbered pages 1-9 and a four page witness statement from Mr Qureshi.

SERVICE

2. Having considered the notice of hearing and the witness statement of Mr Qureshi, Hearing Officer, the Panel was satisfied that notice of the hearing was served on Mr Ali in accordance with the RICS Regulatory Tribunal rules Version 2 with effect from 2 February 2022 ("RTR").

PROCEEDING IN ABSENCE

3. The Panel noted the submissions of Mr Geering and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

4. The Panel reminded itself that the discretion to proceed in absence must be exercised with the utmost care and caution. The Panel noted that following the service of the Notice of Hearing on 25 April 2025, Mr Ali had completed RICS' Case Management Form, on 10 May 2025 in which he stated he did not intend to be present at the hearing or to be represented. He had also indicated that he did not think an oral hearing was required.

5. The Panel was mindful of the observations of Sir Brian Levenson in *Adeogba v. General Medical Council [2016] EWCA Civ 162* as to the burden on all professionals subject to a regulatory regime to engage with the regulator both in relation to the investigation and the ultimate resolution of allegations made against them. The Panel specifically considered the issue of fairness to Mr Ali of proceeding in his absence, but also fairness to the RICS and the wider public interest in the expeditious discharge of the Panel's function. The Panel was satisfied that Mr Ali had voluntarily

waived his right to attend. The Panel was not persuaded when balancing Mr Ali's interests and the public interest, that any adjournment was likely to secure his attendance and would not outweigh the public interest in proceeding with the hearing. The allegations were serious, involving dishonesty. The Panel was satisfied in all the circumstances that it was in the public interest and in the interests of justice overall to proceed in the absence of Mr Ali.

WITNESS EVIDENCE

6. At the outset of the hearing Mr Geering indicated that he was not calling any of his witnesses but rather relying on the written evidence and the documents they produced. He submitted that the vast majority of the documentation could be described as business documentation, with the witnesses exhibiting documents in existence and these were admissible in the criminal jurisdiction by virtue of section 117 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003. He contended that the documents were relevant and it was fair to admit them under Rule 121 RTR as firstly in his Case Management Form Mr Ali had indicated that he wanted a paper hearing (where no witnesses would be called) and, secondly, he was subsequently asked by RICS if there were any witnesses that he wished to question and unless he informed RICS, they would seek to rely on the written documentation. Mr Ali did not respond to this request.

7. The Panel noted the submissions of Mr Geering and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. It was satisfied that it was fair in the circumstances to admit the written witness statements of all the witnesses without them being called, because Mr Ali had not objected to this course, and the majority of the evidence was simply exhibiting documents that were already in existence, and could be properly categorised as business records.

ALLEGATIONS

The formal charges are as follows:

1. On or about 22 November 2021, Mr Ali submitted an RICS Associate Application form to RICS. Mr Ali acted dishonestly in that he:

   i. Deleted the declaration regarding previous convictions from the form prior to submitting it to RICS and / or not declared his conviction(s) when he knew he should do so;

   ii. Stated in the form that he was employed by Cosey Homes since August 2020 when he knew this information was inaccurate;

   iii. Stated in the form that he held an honours Bachelor of Arts degree awarded by the University of Bradford in July 2020 which he knew to be untrue;

   iv. Stated in the form that he held a Bachelor of Science degree awarded by Leeds Beckett University in July 2023 which he knew to be untrue.

   Contrary to Rule 3 of the Rules of Conduct for Members version 7

   Mr Imran Ali is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

2. On 30 January 2022, Mr Ali sent an email to RICS to which he attached an image of a certificate purporting to demonstrate that he had been admitted as a member of the Chartered Institute of Building ("CIOB"). Mr Ali acted dishonestly in that he knew that the copy certificate was a forgery and that he was not a member of CIOB.

   Contrary to Rule 3 of the Rules of Conduct for Members version 7

   Mr Imran Ali is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

3. On 4 March 2022, Mr Ali submitted an application for direct entry to RICS dated 15 February 2022. Mr Ali acted dishonestly in that he:

   i. Stated 'NO' in the form in response to the question: 'Have you been subject to any charge or conviction of a criminal offence which could result in a custodial sentence, unless it is now a spent conviction as provided in the Rehabilitation of

Offenders Act 1974 or the equivalent in your jurisdiction?'. Mr Ali knew this declaration was untrue;

ii. Stated in the form that his current employer was Cosey Homes Ltd, and / or that he had been employed by this employer since August 2020 when he knew either or both of these statements were untrue;

iii. Stated in the form that he held a Bachelor of Science degree awarded by Leeds Beckett University in July 2004 which he knew was untrue;

iv. Attached a CIOB certificate which he knew was forged.

Contrary to Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct (Global)

Mr Imran Ali is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

4. On 31 March 2022, Mr Ali submitted an AssocRICS to MRICS application to RICS. Mr Ali acted dishonestly in that he:

   i. Stated in the application that he held a Bachelor of Science degree awarded by Leeds Beckett University in July 2004 which he knew to be untrue;

   ii. Stated in the application that he had been a chartered member of the Chartered Institute of Building since 2011 which he knew to be untrue.

Contrary to Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct (Global)

Mr Imran Ali is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

5. On or around May 2022 at Westminster Magistrates' Court, Mr Ali, in his previous name of Mohammed Aumran, was convicted of fraud by false representation for which he was subsequently sentenced to 23 weeks imprisonment suspended for 24 months.

Mr Imran Ali is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-law 5.2.2(d)

6. On or around 25 July 2022, Mr Ali submitted another AssocRICS to MRICS application to RICS. Mr Ali acted dishonestly in that he:

i. Stated that he held a Bachelor of Science degree awarded by Leeds Beckett University in July 2004 which he knew to be untrue;

ii. Stated that he had been a chartered member of the Chartered Institute of Building since 2007 which he knew to be untrue;

iii. Stated that he had been a chartered member of the Chartered Association of Building Engineers since 2011 which he knew to be untrue;

iv. Stated that a Kalanther Ithrees was his counsellor without Mr Ithrees' knowledge or agreement and/or provided his own email address purporting it to be that of Mr Ithrees.

Contrary to Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct (Global)

Mr Imran Ali is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

7. On a date between 30 July 2022 and 28 September 2022, Mr Ali sent an image of a certificate to RICS that purported to certify that Mr Ali had been elected Member of the Chartered Institution of Civil Engineering Surveyors (CICES) on 28 June 2007 intending that RICS believe that Mr Ali was a member of CICES. Mr Ali acted dishonestly in that he knew that the copy certificate was a forgery and that he was not a member of CICES.

Contrary to Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct (Global)

Mr Imran Ali is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

8. On or around 28 September 2022, Mr Ali submitted a further application form to RICS for direct entry to RICS dated 25 September 2022. Mr Ali acted dishonestly in that he:

i. Stated 'NO' in response to the question: 'Have you been subject to any charge or conviction of a criminal offence which could result in a custodial sentence, unless it is now a spent conviction as provided in the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974 or the equivalent in your jurisdiction?'. Mr Ali knew this declaration was untrue;

ii. Stated that he had been employed by Cosey Homes since May 2019 which he knew was untrue;

iii. Stated that he had been employed by Countrywide Surveyors between May 2017 and May 2019 which he knew was untrue;

iv. Stated that he held a Bachelor of Science degree in Surveying awarded by Leeds Beckett University in 2003 which he knew to be untrue;

v. Stated that he held a Bachelor of Science degree in Civil Engineering awarded by Leeds Beckett University in 2005 which he knew to be untrue and/or

vi. Named his proposer as a Kalanther Ithrees without Mr Ithrees' knowledge or agreement and/or forged a signature purporting it to be that of Mr Ithrees.

Contrary to Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct (Global)

Mr Imran Ali is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

9. In March 2024, Mr Imran Ali submitted a completed starter form to obtain employment with a firm called Monaghans. Mr Ali acted dishonestly in that:

i. He deleted the following declaration from the starter form before submitting it: Have you ever been convicted of, or involved in, any criminal activity or offence that you need to bring to the Companies notice (exclude only minor driving and parking offences);

ii. He knew he had received conviction(s) which he was required to declare and he did not do so.

Contrary to Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct (Global)

Mr Imran Ali is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

10. While employed by Monaghans, Mr Ali acted dishonestly in that he:

i. Between around 22 March 2024 and 17 April 2024, sent copies of company files / documents to his personal email, knowing that he did not have the authority to do so;

ii. On about 21 April 2024, submitted a forged Discharge Note from Leeds General Infirmary to his employer.

Contrary to Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct (Global)

Mr Imran Ali is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

11. Between 8 July 2024 and 13 July 2024, Mr Ali produced Residential Valuation Reports in respect of a property in Well Lane, Leeds and a property in Florence Grove, Leeds. Those two reports were produced on behalf of Mr Ali's own firm, IA Surveying Solutions Limited ("IA Surveying"). Mr Ali had been suspended from membership of RICS on 29 February 2024 for a period of 12 months. Mr Ali acted dishonestly in that:

    i. The cover page of each report bore the RICS logo and / or the words 'Regulated by RICS' when Mr Ali knew that IA Surveying was not regulated by RICS and/or

    ii. He knew that his personal membership of RICS had been suspended and he knew he was not entitled to describe himself as 'an RICS Registered Valuer and Chartered Surveyor' and / or as 'MRICS'.

Contrary to Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct (Global)

Mr Imran Ali is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

12. On or about 27 September 2024, Mr Ali acted dishonestly in that he completed and signed an Expert Witness Report on behalf of Legal Surveyors UK using the MRICS designation, when he knew that his membership of RICS had been suspended on 29 February 2024 for a period of 12 months.

Contrary to Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct (Global)

Mr Imran Ali is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

13. While employed by Charles Garth Limited, Mr Ali acted dishonestly in that:

    i. From March 2024 he knowingly worked in breach of his interim suspension order;

    ii. He submitted to his employer for payment a fabricated invoice in the sum of £3,924 dated 23 August 2024 intending his employer to believe that it was a genuine invoice on behalf of CDC Draincare.

Contrary to Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct (Global)

Mr Imran Ali is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

BACKGROUND

8. Mr Ali became an Associate Member of RICS on 4 March 2022 (AssocRICS). He became a Member of RICS on 7 October 2022 (MRICS). On 14 October 2023 RICS received an anonymous concern alleging that Mr Ali was a serial fraudster. Following an investigation the case was referred to a hearing by the Head of Regulation on 21 March 2025.

9. Mr Ali was previously called Mohammad Aumran. On 9 September 2019 he was convicted at Leeds Crown Court of multiple counts of "*dishonestly making false representation to make gain for self / another or cause loss to other / expose other to risk*". On 10 October 2019 he was sentenced to 37 months' imprisonment for these offences. These included diverting monies from his employer to his own bank account. Mr Ali was in custody from 10 October 2019 until December 2020.

10. The Allegations concern various types of dishonest behaviour from November 2021 until September 2024. They include submitting five Applications to RICS for associate status or direct entry where it is alleged Mr Ali made false declarations about having no previous convictions or deleted the section on the application form concerning previous convictions; lied about his employment and lied about his qualifications and membership of professional bodies. These included submitting forged certificates and dishonestly stating that an individual was his counsellor without that individual's knowledge or consent. In addition, there was an allegation of a conviction for fraud by false representation resulting in 23 weeks imprisonment suspended for two years at Westminster Magistrates Court in

May 2022. Further, there were allegations of dishonest behaviour towards two employers in 2024, including not declaring his previous convictions; copying files to his personal email and submitting a forged hospital discharge note. He also, though his own company, produced residential valuation reports, which referred to his RICS membership, when he knew that his membership had been suspended by RICS at an interim suspension hearing in February 2024. He also dishonestly completed an expert report with a RICS designation when he was suspended and worked in breach of his interim suspension order and submitted a fabricated invoice to his employer.

RICS SUBMISSIONS

11. Mr Geering relied upon the submissions set out in his Case Summary and contended that each of the allegations are capable of proof. He relied on RICS's witness evidence and the documentary evidence.

12. Mr Geering contended that Mr Ali was dishonest in respect of each of the allegations where it was alleged. For example, deleting the first question about previous convictions on his first application form to RICS was clearly a deliberate act to avoid having to declare his criminal conviction for fraud. He knew he had to declare his convictions and he deleted this question to avoid doing so. That is an objectively dishonest act. In effect, he sought to cheat his way into membership of RICS. Mr Geering submitted that Mr Ali was dishonest in respect of all the allegations on the basis of the two-stage test in *Ivey v Genting Casinos [2017] UKSC 67.*

SUBMISSIONS BY MR ALI

13. There were no submissions from Mr Ali.

FINDINGS OF FACT

14. The Panel accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. The standard of proof to be applied throughout was the ordinary civil standard of proof, namely the balance of probabilities. It reminded itself that the burden of proof was on RICS alone and that Mr Ali's absence added nothing to RICS's case. It applied Collins J's observations in *Lawrance v. GMC [2015] EWHC 581(Admin)* to the effect that in cases of dishonesty, cogent evidence was required to reach the civil standard of proof.

14. In respect of each of the allegations where dishonesty was alleged, the Panel had taken the approach of first ascertaining Mr Ali's state of knowledge or belief as to the facts and then determining whether the conduct was honest or dishonest by applying the objective standards of ordinary decent people (following the test in *Ivey v Genting Casinos [2017] UKSC 67*).

Allegation 1:

On or about 22 November 2021, Mr Ali submitted an RICS Associate Application form to RICS. Mr Ali acted dishonestly in that he:

i. Deleted the declaration regarding previous convictions from the form prior to submitting it to RICS and / or not declared his conviction(s) when he knew he should do so;
ii. Stated in the form that he was employed by Cosey Homes since August 2020 when he knew this information was inaccurate;
iii. Stated in the form that he held an honours Bachelor of Arts degree awarded by the University of Bradford in July 2020 which he knew to be untrue;

iv. Stated in the form that he held a Bachelor of Science degree awarded by Leeds Beckett University in July 2023 which he knew to be untrue. Contrary to Rule 3 of the Rules of Conduct for Members version 7.

15. The Panel was satisfied by the certificate of conviction before it (and the correction as to the date by Mr Greenfield's witness statement) that Mr Ali had been convicted in September 2019 of dishonestly making false representations and received a custodial sentence of 37 months imprisonment.

16. The Panel was satisfied that Mr Burdis, a "Corporate Specialist" at RICS had produced the RICS Associate Application form submitted by Mr Ali. The Panel was satisfied by comparing that form to the original form that Mr Ali had deleted the question asking to declare previous convictions. It was satisfied that this was a deliberate act done in an attempt to avoid having to declare his previous conviction. It was satisfied that this act shows he knew he should have declared the conviction and would be considered dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people. Accordingly, Allegation 1 (i) was was proved.

17. The Panel accepted that Mr Ali's assertion in the form that he was employed by Cosey Holmes since August 2020 (when he was in fact in prison until December 2020) was inaccurate and that he knew it was inaccurate. It accepted Ms Cosey's evidence that he did not start work at that firm until August 2021. As the Panel was satisfied that Mr Ali knew it was a false declaration, it was also satisfied that it would be considered dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people. Accordingly, Allegation 1 (ii) was proved.

18. Mr Ali's form also stated that he held a Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Bradford and a Bachelor of Science Degree from Leeds Beckett

University. The Panel accepted the witness evidence and accompanying email of Mr Roper-Newman, the Information Governing Officer at the University of Bradford (despite a different date of birth being entered for Mr Ali) that there was no evidence of Mr Ali (or Mr Aumran – his former name) ever having attended the University of Bradford or ever having obtained this qualification. Similarly, in respect of Leeds Beckett University, the Panel accepted the evidence of Alex Whitehead who indicated that Mr Ali (in his previous name) had enrolled at the university in the 2021/2022 academic year, but had not passed any exams. The Panel was satisfied Mr Ali knew this information on the RICS form was untrue and the Panel was satisfied they would be considered dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people. Accordingly, Allegation 1 (iii) and (iv) were proved.

Allegation 2

On 30 January 2022, Mr Ali sent an email to RICS to which he attached an image of a certificate purporting to demonstrate that he had been admitted as a member of the Chartered Institute of Building ("CIOB"). Mr Ali acted dishonestly in that he knew that the copy certificate was a forgery and that he was not a member of CIOB.

Contrary to Rule 3 of the Rules of Conduct for Members version 7

Mr Imran Ali is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

19. The Panel has seen the email from Mr Ali to RICS dated 30 January 2022 which attached a certificate purporting to demonstrate that he was an admitted member of the Chartered Institute of Building ("CIOB)"). The Panel accepted the evidence of Mr Marcham, Head of Governance at the Chartered Institute of Building that Mr Ali only became an "applicant

member" in February 2022 – after he claimed to be a Member ("MCIOB") and that he never became a chartered member and was not therefore entitled to refer to himself as MCIOB. Mr Marcham also stated that he could" *"confirm this is a genuine certificate however this does not belong to Mr Ali, the membership number correlates to a past Member*." The Panel was satisfied that the certificate was a forgery and that at the time Mr Ali was not a member – in any form – of CIOB and knew he was not. The Panel was satisfied this conduct would be considered dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people. Accordingly, Allegation 2 was proved.

Allegation 3

On 4 March 2022, Mr Ali submitted an application for direct entry to RICS dated 15 February 2022. Mr Ali acted dishonestly in that he:

i. Stated 'NO' in the form in response to the question: 'Have you been subject to any charge or conviction of a criminal offence which could result in a custodial sentence, unless it is now a spent conviction as provided in the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974 or the equivalent in your jurisdiction?'. Mr Ali knew this declaration was untrue;
ii. Stated in the form that his current employer was Cosey Homes Ltd, and / or that he had been employed by this employer since August 2020 when he knew either or both of these statements were untrue;
iii. Stated in the form that he held a Bachelor of Science degree awarded by Leeds Beckett University in July 2004 which he knew was untrue;
iv. Attached a CIOB certificate which he knew was forged.

Contrary to Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct (Global)

Mr Imran Ali is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

20. The Panel has noted Mr Ali's application for direct entry to RICS which he submitted on 4 March 2022, which contained the answer "no" to whether he had any previous convictions, the assertion that Cosey Homes was his current employer and had been since August 2020; an assertion of having been awarded a BSC from Leeds university in July 2004 and the attachment of the forged CIOB certificate referred to an Allegation 2.

21. The Panel was satisfied for the reasons and on the evidence set out above that Mr Ali knew these assertions to be untrue and the certificate to be forged and that he acted dishonestly in relation to each particular. Accordingly, Allegation 3 and all particulars were proved.

Allegation 4

On 31 March 2022, Mr Ali submitted an AssocRICS to MRICS application to RICS. Mr Ali acted dishonestly in that he:

i. Stated in the application that he held a Bachelor of Science degree awarded by Leeds Beckett University in July 2004 which he knew to be untrue;

ii. Stated in the application that he had been a chartered member of the Chartered Institute of Building since 2011 which he knew to be untrue.

Contrary to Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct (Global)

Mr Imran Ali is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

22. This relates to a second "*AssocRICS to MRICS application*", which was submitted by Mr Ali on 31 March 2022. In it he stated he had a BSC from Leeds Beckett University awarded in July 2004 and that he was a chartered member of COIB since 2011. On the evidence and for the reasons set out above, the Panel was satisfied that Mr Ali knew these entries on the application were untrue and that this conduct would be considered dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people. Accordingly, Allegation 4 was proved in its entirety.

Allegation 5

On or around May 2022 at Westminster Magistrates' Court, Mr Ali, in his previous name of Mohammed Aumran, was convicted of fraud by false representation for which he was subsequently sentenced to 23 weeks imprisonment suspended for 24 months.

Mr Imran Ali is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-law 5.2.2(d)

23. This alleges that Mr Ali in his previous name was convicted of fraud by false representation at Westminster Magistrates Court in May 2022 when he received 23-week custodial sentence suspended for two years. The Panel was satisfied that the Memorandum of Conviction it has seen proves this allegation. Accordingly, Allegation 5 is proved.

Allegation 6

On or around 25 July 2022, Mr Ali submitted another AssocRICS to MRICS application to RICS. Mr Ali acted dishonestly in that he:

i. Stated that he held a Bachelor of Science degree awarded by Leeds Beckett University in July 2004 which he knew to be untrue;

ii. Stated that he had been a chartered member of the Chartered Institute of Building since 2007 which he knew to be untrue;

iii. Stated that he had been a chartered member of the Chartered Association of Building Engineers since 2011 which he knew to be untrue;

iv. Stated that a Kalanther Ithrees was his counsellor without Mr Ithrees' knowledge or agreement and/or provided his own email address purporting it to be that of Mr Ithrees.

Contrary to Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct (Global)

Mr Imran Ali is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

24. This allegation concerns a further application to become a member of RICS by Mr Ali submitted on 25 July 2022. The Panel noted that Mr Ali had put in different dates on this application for his BSC from Leeds Beckett university and for his membership of CIOB. It also contained a claim to be a chartered member of the Chartered Association of Building Engineers ("CABE") since 2011. The Panel accepted the evidence of Mr Pearson, Associate Director Legal Governance and Operations at CABE that indicated Mr Ali had been an "associate member" since 2022, and was updated to "member" in March 2023, on the basis that Mr Ali had obtained MRICS status, and was therefore not a chartered member of CABE at the time he made the application, let alone since 2011. Mr Ali had also stated in the application that Mr Ithrees was his counsellor and provided his own email address purporting it to be that of Mr Ithrees. The Panel was satisfied on Mr Ithrees's statement that

this had been done without his knowledge or agreement. He had agreed to be his proposer but not to act as a counsellor.

25. The Panel was satisfied on the evidence set out above and for the reason set out above that Mr Ali knew these assertions to be untrue and that this conduct would be regarded as dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people. Accordingly, Allegation 6 was proved in its entirety.

Allegation 7

On a date between 30 July 2022 and 28 September 2022, Mr Ali sent an image of a certificate to RICS that purported to certify that Mr Ali had been elected Member of the Chartered Institution of Civil Engineering Surveyors (CICES) on 28 June 2007 intending that RICS believe that Mr Ali was a member of CICES. Mr Ali acted dishonestly in that he knew that the copy certificate was a forgery and that he was not a member of CICES.

Contrary to Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct (Global)

Mr Imran Ali is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

26. This allegation concerns sending RICS an image of a certificate purporting to certify Mr Ali had been elected a member of the Chartered Institution of Civil Engineering Surveyors ("CICES") on 28 June 2007 intending RICS to believe he was a member of CICES. The Panel was satisfied on the evidence of Serena Egerton, Membership Manager, CICES the Mr Ali is not and has never been a member of CICES. The Panel is satisfied that Mr Ali knew the certificate was a forgery because he was not a member and that he intended to deceive RICS into believing he was a member. This would

be considered dishonest conduct by ordinary decent people and accordingly Allegation 7 is proved.

Allegation 8

On or around 28 September 2022, Mr Ali submitted a further application form to RICS for direct entry to RICS dated 25 September 2022. Mr Ali acted dishonestly in that he:

i. Stated 'NO' in response to the question: 'Have you been subject to any charge or conviction of a criminal offence which could result in a custodial sentence, unless it is now a spent conviction as provided in the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974 or the equivalent in your jurisdiction?'. Mr Ali knew this declaration was untrue;

ii. Stated that he had been employed by Cosey Homes since May 2019 which he knew was untrue;

iii. Stated that he had been employed by Countrywide Surveyors between May 2017 and May 2019 which he knew was untrue;

iv. Stated that he held a Bachelor of Science degree in Surveying awarded by Leeds Beckett University in 2003 which he knew to be untrue;

v. Stated that he held a Bachelor of Science degree in Civil Engineering awarded by Leeds Beckett University in 2005 which he knew to be untrue and/or

vi. Named his proposer as a Kalanther Ithrees without Mr Ithrees' knowledge or agreement and/or forged a signature purporting it to be that of Mr Ithrees.

Contrary to Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct (Global)

Mr Imran Ali is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

27. This allegation concerns a further application to RICS by Mr Ali for direct entry submitted on 28 September 2022. This form included a claim of working for Countrywide Surveyors between 2017 and 2019. The Panel accepted the evidence of Miss Freeman, Director of Field Operations at Countrywide Surveyors that Mr Ali was not employed by them during those years but rather only worked for them from May to June 2022. For the reasons and on the evidence set out above, the Panel was satisfied that Mr Ali knew that each of his assertions set out in the particulars in Allegation 8 were untrue and that this conduct would be considered dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people. Accordingly, Allegation 8 and all its particulars were proved.

Allegation 9

In March 2024, Mr Imran Ali submitted a completed starter form to obtain employment with a firm called Monaghans. Mr Ali acted dishonestly in that:

i. He deleted the following declaration from the starter form before submitting it: Have you ever been convicted of, or involved in, any criminal activity or offence that you need to bring to the Companies notice (exclude only minor driving and parking offences);

ii. He knew he had received conviction(s) which he was required to declare and he did not do so.

Contrary to Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct (Global)

Mr Imran Ali is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

28. This allegation concerns dishonestly not declaring his previous convictions on a starter form to a potential employer called Monaghans by deleting the previous conviction declaration. The Panel accepted the evidence shown on the form produced by Ms McGarr. The Panel was satisfied that this was deliberate deceit by Mr Ali and would be considered dishonest conduct by the standards of ordinary decent people. Accordingly, Allegation 9 was proved.

Allegation 10

While employed by Monaghans, Mr Ali acted dishonestly in that he:

i. Between around 22 March 2024 and 17 April 2024, sent copies of company files / documents to his personal email, knowing that he did not have the authority to do so;

ii. On about 21 April 2024, submitted a forged Discharge Note from Leeds General Infirmary to his employer.

Contrary to Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct (Global)

Mr Imran Ali is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

29. This allegation concerns Mr Ali sending copies of company files to his personal email when he was not authorised to do so while employed at Monaghan, and submitting a forged discharge note to his employer reporting to be from Leeds General Infirmary. The Panel was satisfied on the evidence of Miss McGarr and on the face of the documents that Mr Ali sent copies of

company files and documents to his personal email without being authorised to do so. It was further satisfied that the document was forged, based on Ms McGarr's analysis of the properties of the discharge summary, which indicated that the document was created on 21 April 2024 and its author was Mr Ali in his previous name. The Panel was satisfied that this conduct would be considered dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people. Accordingly, Allegation 10 was proved.

Allegation 11

Between 8 July 2024 and 13 July 2024, Mr Ali produced Residential Valuation Reports in respect of a property in Well Lane, Leeds and a property in Florence Grove, Leeds. Those two reports were produced on behalf of Mr Ali's own firm, IA Surveying Solutions Limited ("IA Surveying"). Mr Ali had been suspended from membership of RICS on 29 February 2024 for a period of 12 months. Mr Ali acted dishonestly in that:

i. The cover page of each report bore the RICS logo and / or the words 'Regulated by RICS' when Mr Ali knew that IA Surveying was not regulated by RICS and/or

ii. He knew that his personal membership of RICS had been suspended and he knew he was not entitled to describe himself as 'an RICS Registered Valuer and Chartered Surveyor' and / or as 'MRICS'.

Contrary to Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct (Global)

Mr Imran Ali is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

30. This allegation concerns producing residential evaluation reports for two properties on behalf of Mr Ali's own firm ("IA Surveying") which bore RICS's logo and the phrase "regulated by RICS". The Panel was satisfied that Mr Ali had been made subject to a 12 month interim suspension order by RICS on 29 February 2024. It was satisfied that when these reports were produced that Mr Ali knew that he had been suspended and that he was not entitled to describe himself as an RICS registered valuer or "MRICS". The Panel was satisfied that such conduct would be considered dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people. Accordingly, Allegation 11 was proved.

Allegation 12

On or about 27 September 2024, Mr Ali acted dishonestly in that he completed and signed an Expert Witness Report on behalf of Legal Surveyors UK using the MRICS designation, when he knew that his membership of RICS had been suspended on 29 February 2024 for a period of 12 months.

Contrary to Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct (Global)

Mr Imran Ali is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

31. This allegation concerns Mr Ali producing an expert witness report with him using an "MRICS" designation. The Panel was satisfied that he knew he had been suspended in February 2024 and that he was not entitled to use this declaration. It was satisfied that it was dishonest conduct and would be so judged by the standards of ordinary decent people. Accordingly allegation 12 is proved.

Allegation 13

While employed by Charles Garth Limited, Mr Ali acted dishonestly in that:

i. From March 2024 he knowingly worked in breach of his interim suspension order;
ii. He submitted to his employer for payment a fabricated invoice in the sum of £3,924 dated 23 August 2024 intending his employer to believe that it was a genuine invoice on behalf of CDC Draincare.

Contrary to Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct (Global)

Mr Imran Ali is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

32. This allegation concerns dishonestly working for Charles Garth Limited in breach of his interim suspension order and submitting a fabricated invoice intending his employer to believe it was a genuine invoice on behalf of CDC Draincare. The Panel was satisfied on the evidence of Mr McCardle from Charles Garth Limited that Mr Ali commenced working there from March 2024. It was further satisfied that this was in breach of the RICS interim suspension order. The Panel was satisfied on the evidence of Ms Parkins of Charles Garth Limited, who contacted CDC Draincare, that the invoice Mr Ali presented for payment was not a genuine invoice. The Panel was satisfied that this conduct set out in both particulars would separately be considered dishonest conduct by the standards of ordinary decent people and accordingly Allegation 13 was proved in its entirety.

Liability for Disciplinary Action

33. The Panel next considered separately whether Mr Ali was liable to disciplinary action under bylaw 5.2.2. (c) .

34. The Panel accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. It reminded itself that liability to disciplinary action was a matter for the judgment of the Panel. It was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Ali amounted to breaches of his professional obligations that were wide ranging, serious and committed over a prolonged period. The findings of dishonesty were breaches of fundamental tenets of the profession, namely the need to be honest and act with integrity and were therefore very serious. The Panel had no doubt that that the conduct proved in each of the allegations was individually and collectively sufficiently serious to render Mr Ali liable to disciplinary action.

SANCTION

35. The Panel next considered the matter of sanction and noted the submissions of Mr Geering. It accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. It had regard to RICS' Sanctions Policy, and in particular the overriding principles of acting in the public interest, to protect the public, the reputation of the profession and to declare and uphold proper standards while bearing in mind the overriding principles of proportionality.

36. The Panel reminded itself that the purpose of sanctions is not to be punitive, though that may be their effect. The purpose of sanctions is to declare and uphold the standards of the profession, to safeguard the reputation of the profession and of RICS as its regulator and to protect the public. Sanctions must be proportionate to the matters found proved.

37. The Panel considered carefully any mitigating and aggravating factors of this case as well as the issue of proportionality in weighing up the most appropriate response.

38. The Panel were unable to identify any mitigating factors.

39. The Panel considered that the following aggravating factors were present:

- Proved conduct involved multiple allegations of dishonesty over a prolonged period
- The extent and nature of the dishonesty, the submissions of forgeries were indicative of profound attitudinal issues
- The conduct was pre- planned and deliberate for personal gain
- Mr Ali obtained membership by fraud and caused actual harm to the public and employers and his conduct had the potential to cause harm
- No evidence of insight or remorse
- The conduct breached the trust the public placed in the profession and undermined the reputation of the profession

40. The Panel was mindful of the factors set out in paragraph 7 of the sanctions policy for "considering the seriousness of a breach and possible sanction" and noted that Mr Ali's conduct involved many of the factors listed including, in particular, that it was dishonest, benefited him and was repeated over a prolonged period of time.

41. Given the Panel's view of the seriousness of Mr Ali's conduct, it was satisfied that the sanctions of Caution, Reprimand, Undertakings, a Fine and Conditions were insufficient to protect the public and highlight to the profession and the public the gravity of the proven conduct. Such sanctions were insufficient to uphold standards given what the Panel considered was Mr Ali's flagrant disregard of the RICS Rules over a prolonged period. The Panel was mindful that dishonesty in a professional lay at the top end of the spectrum of misconduct and was satisfied in the circumstances that the proven conduct by Mr Ali was fundamentally incompatible with continued membership of RICS. The Panel was satisfied that only expulsion of Mr Ali from RICS was sufficient to mark the seriousness to the profession and the public and was the appropriate and proportionate sanction. The Panel was satisfied that it was

appropriate given that membership had been obtained fraudulently and the consequent risk to the public that the expulsion shall have immediate effect.

Publication

42. The Panel was satisfied that no justifiable basis was advanced for departing from the presumption of publication. The Panel considered the policy on publication of decisions, The Sanctions Policy Supplement 3 - Publication of Regulatory Disciplinary Matters. This decision will be published on the RICS website and in the RICS magazine Modus.

Costs

43. RICS has submitted a statement of costs and claimed the sum of £35,595.50. (This had been reduced to reflect the shorter time RICS Counsel was engaged rather than the three days estimated). Mr Ali had submitted a statement of means contending that he had no income and no savings. These assertions were unsubstantiated by any evidence.

44. The Panel had regard to Supplement 2 to the Sanctions Policy in relation to costs. It was satisfied that it was appropriate to make an award of costs in this case in favour of RICS. It was further satisfied that the costs claimed by RICS were reasonably incurred given the extensive preparation involved. It rejected Mr Ali's assertion to his means. The Panel was satisfied that it was fair and reasonable to make a costs award in the full sum of £35,595.50. Accordingly, it directed that Mr Ali pay RICS costs in the sum of £35,595.50.

Appeal Period

45. The Relevant Person has 28 days, from the service of the notification of the decision, to appeal this decision in accordance with Rule 152 of the Rules.